



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645
518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

SURGERY SPECIALTY HOSPITAL OF AMERICA SE
4301 VISTA RD
PASADENA TX 77504-2117

Respondent Name

NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE COMPANY

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 19

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-09-5967-01

MFDR Date Received

February 6, 2009

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Surgery Specialty Hospital Of America, S.E. charges fair and reasonable rates for its services. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services. The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Surgery Specialty Hospital Of America, S.E. is at a minimum, 70% of the billed charges. This is supported by the Focus managed care contract."

Amount in Dispute: \$8,796.17

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "...the Respondent reimbursed the Requestor at a fair and reasonable rate in accordance with Rule 134.401(a)(4). This methodology used was the Respondent's usual and customary, fair and reasonable reimbursement for procedures that do not have a 'MAR' value."

Response Submitted by: Downs Stanford, P.C., 2001 Bryan Street, Suite 4000, Dallas, Texas 75201

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

| Date(s) of Service | Disputed Services | Amount In Dispute | Amount Due |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| February 7, 2008 | Outpatient Hospital Services | \$8,796.17 | \$0.00 |

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective January 17, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 428, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline or a negotiated contract, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(f) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement shall: (1) be consistent with the criteria of

Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) be based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and/or values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available.”

3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - O5G – RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE BASED ON NEGOTIATED DISCOUNT/RATE.
 - OQR – Qmedtrix - This service is considered as part of the Global Surgical Package.
 - OVC – Qmedtrix - Payment is included in the allowance for another service procedure.
 - 4VT – CLAIM SPECIFIC NEGOTIATED DISCOUNT.
 - OBN – Qmedtrix - This service is included in primary or more extensive procedure.
 - OR8 – Qmedtrix - W10 No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement

Findings

1. The insurance carrier denied or reduced payment for disputed services using codes O5G – “RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE BASED ON NEGOTIATED DISCOUNT/RATE” and 4VT – “CLAIM SPECIFIC NEGOTIATED DISCOUNT.” Review of the submitted information found no documentation to support that the disputed services were subject to a negotiated rate, claim specific negotiated discount, or other contractual agreement between the parties to this dispute. Nevertheless, on October 11, 2011, the Division requested the respondent to provide a copy of the referenced contract(s) between the parties to the dispute and/or any network, pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(l), which states that “The commission may request other additional information from either party to review the medical fee issues in dispute. The other additional information shall be received by the division within 14 days of receipt of this request” and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d-3), which states, in pertinent part, that “An insurance carrier shall provide copies of each contract described by Subsection (d-1) to the division on the request of the division. . . . For medical fee disputes that arise regarding non-network and out-of-network care, the division may request that copies of each contract under which fees are being paid be submitted to the division for review.” The respondent replied by letter dated October 26, 2011 that “A review of the EOB shows that ANSI code ‘45’ was not utilized on the EOB. Therefore, no PPO contract was utilized. Therefore, the most recent request for documents is unnecessary as no contract was utilized in this case.” The respondent did not otherwise submit copies of any contract(s) or other additional requested documentation. The above denial/reduction reasons are not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed for payment in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective May 25, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires that the request shall include “a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include”... “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective May 25, 2008, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor’s position statement asserts that “Surgery Specialty Hospital Of America, S.E. charges fair and reasonable rates for its services. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services.”
 - The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
 - Documentation of the comparison of charges to other carriers was not presented for review.
 - Documentation of the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services was not presented for review.
 - The Division has previously found that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of

providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors,” as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 *Texas Register* 6276. It further states that “Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges...” 22 *Texas Register* 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital’s “usual and customary” charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- In the alternative, the requestor asks to be reimbursed a minimum of 70% of billed charges, in support of which the requestor states that “The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Surgery Specialty Hospital Of America S.E. is at a minimum, 70% of the billed charges. This is supported by the Focus managed care contract.”
- The requestor has provided select exhibit pages from the alleged managed care contract referenced above; however, a copy of the contract referenced in the position statement was not presented for review with this dispute.
- Review of the exhibit pages submitted by the requestor finds a schedule of charges, labeled exhibit “A”, dated 04/23/92, which states that “OUTPATIENT SERVICES: 101/401 PAY 70% OF BILLED CHARGES.”
- The requestor submitted a letter of clarification dated July 30, 1992 indicating a change in reimbursement to the above referenced contract, stating in part that “services rendered to eligible Beneficiaries will be considered at 80% of the usual and reasonable charge which is equal to the lesser of the actual charges billed by HCP; OR the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research Database.”
- The requestor submitted a fee schedule page, labeled exhibit A, dated effective August 1, 1992 which states, in part, that the provider shall receive “an amount equal to eighty percent (80%) of the Usual and Reasonable Charge for those Covered Services. For all purposes hereunder, the Usual and Reasonable Charge for such services shall be equal to the lesser of: (i) the actual charges billed by HCP for such services; or (ii) the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research database.”
- No data or information was submitted from the Medical Data Research database to support the requested reimbursement.
- No documentation was presented by the requestor to support that the referenced contract was in effect at the time of the disputed services.
- The requestor’s position statement further asserts that “amounts paid to healthcare providers by third party payers are relevant to determining fair and reasonable workers’ compensation reimbursement. Further, the Division stated specifically that managed care contracts fulfill the requirements of Texas Labor Code §413.011 as they are ‘relevant to what fair and reasonable reimbursement is,’ ‘they are relevant to achieving cost control,’ ‘they are relevant to ensuring access to quality care,’ and they are ‘highly reliable.’ See 22 Tex. Reg. 6272. Finally, managed care contracts were determined by the Division to be the best indication of a market price voluntarily negotiated for medical services.”
- While managed care contracts are relevant to determining a fair and reasonable reimbursement, the Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, which states at 22 *Texas Register* 6276 that:

A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the requested reimbursement.
- The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| _____ Signature | Grayson Richardson _____ Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer | June 15, 2012 _____ Date |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.